|  |
| --- |
| SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY  **Department of Special Education and Reading**  **Reading 568-01: Practicum in Diagnosis of Reading and Language Arts Difficulties**  **Spring 2014, Davis 208, Mondays 5-7:30 pm** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name:** Michael Rafferty  **Office/Phone:** Davis 209E,203-685-0517  **E-mail:** raffertym2@southernct.edu | **Office Hours:** M 7:30-8:30pm, W 5:00-8:00 pm  S 3:00-5:00 (Newtown)  **Credits**: 3  **Prerequisites**: RDG 520, 565, 566, 567, 585 |

|  |
| --- |
| **COURSE DESCRIPTION:** |

The course includes an individual diagnostic evaluation of difficulties in reading and writing using formal and informal assessment tools appropriate for students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Guided preparation of a case study report is used as a summative assessment.

|  |
| --- |
| **COURSE CONTRIBUTION:** |

This course is designed for certified teachers who are preparing for Remedial Reading/Remedial Language Arts Specialist Certification. The course content includes the study of the causes of difficulties in reading and writing as well as the diagnostic evaluation of difficulties in these areas. Initially, graduate students review how to conduct assessments of emergent literacy skills. The course, however, focuses primarily on the reading and writing difficulties experienced by children in grades 1-12 and how these difficulties are evaluated using formal and informal assessment tools. The content and experiences of this course will allow graduate students to acquire and demonstrate strong professional knowledge and skills for conducting diagnostic evaluations of struggling readers and preparing case reports detailing current levels of performance and recommending instructional accommodations. To gain this diagnostic experience, graduate students conduct an evaluation of a student (grades 1-12) in a clinical setting; and, based on the results of this evaluation, there is guided preparation of an individual case study report. Within the report, graduate students interpret results and demonstrate proficiency in planning to differentiate instruction based on assessment data (integration of findings). Further, instructional recommendations described in the report will include strategies to motivate students as well as suggest interventions that ensure access to literacy development for all learners irrespective of individual circumstances such as cultural and linguistic diversity, socioeconomic status, and/or educational background. Through its examination of the processes of diagnostic inquiry and reflection in relation to individual student needs, RDG 568 prepares future reading professionals in Connecticut schools to use pertinent assessments appropriately. In so doing, reading/language arts consultants (or reading specialists) are better positioned to obtain and evaluate the information necessary to diagnose a variety of reading difficulties and plan an intervention program for diverse readers.

|  |
| --- |
| REQUIRED TEXTS/Other Course Materials |

1. Leslie, L. & Caldwell, L. (2010) *Qualitative Reading Inventory (5th Edition).* Boston, MA: Pearson ISBN-10: 0137019238
2. McKenna, M. & Dougherty Stahl, K. (2008) Assessment for Reading Instruction. Guilford Press ISBN-10: 1606230352

|  |
| --- |
| **COURSE OBJECTIVES: Upon completion of this course, you will** |

1. Understand the reading process and its assessment
2. Recognize factors associated with reading skill acquisition
3. Understand the stages of emergent literacy and beginning reading (initiation), including assessing and teaching print concepts and phonological awareness, fostering comprehension and word recognition, and setting appropriate early intervention goals
4. Formulate questions to direct diagnostic activities and use information from student and parent interviews, as well as classroom observations and teacher reports, to begin planning assessment sessions
5. Understand the various types of ongoing assessments teachers often use
6. Gain knowledge of how the assessment process works within and across a tiered instructional and intervention model (SRBI)
7. Administer, score, and interpret informal reading inventories
8. Properly administer, score, and interpret selected formal assessments (phonological processing, decoding, word recognition, vocabulary, comprehension, writing) according to test guidelines
9. Interpret diagnostic information to inform and adjust instruction as appropriate
10. Prepare, write, revise, and report diagnostic information to parents and school planning teams
11. Investigate resources (e.g. SERC library; *Promoting Academic Achievement Among English Learners;* the Reading Recovery website; the International Dyslexia Association annual conference; Kuzweil; speech recognition software; etc.) or additional reading tests to gain information concerning assessment, remediation, and instruction

|  |
| --- |
| **INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION (IRA) STANDARDS / GUIDELINES:** |

The IRA Standards for Reading Professionals include competencies specific to:

1-Foundational Knowledge

2-Instructional Strategies, Materials, and Curriculum

**3-Assessment and Evaluation**

4-Diversity

5-Literate Environment

6- Professional Learning and Leadership.

These standards were used in the preparation of this course and are included at the end of the syllabus so you can cross-reference course objectives with the professional standards and state guidelines for certification.

**Learner outcomes and their relationship to professional standards:** The student will

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **IRA:** 1.1, 1.3 | 1. Describe the multiple causes of reading difficulties and the factors that put a child at-risk for reading and writing problems, including social, economic, and cultural factors. |
| **IRA:** 1.1, 1.3, 3.1 | 2. Recognize the symptoms that would indicate primary and secondary causes of reading and writing difficulties. |
| **IRA:** 3.1 | 3. Describe the implication of the causative factors for remedial reading instruction. |
| **IRA:** 3.1, 4.3 | 4. Describe the effect of second language learning on the acquisition of English literacy. |
| **IRA:** 3.1, 3.4 | 5. Describe the role of the Reading/ Language Arts Specialist or Consultant in dealing with these causes or in referring the child to others services in the school system. |
| **IRA:** 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 | 6. Decide what data needs to be gathered for a particular reading/writing diagnostic situation. |
| **IRA:** 3.1, 3.2 | 7. Select emergent literacy, reading and writing tests, and/or informal procedures for assessing children. |
| **IRA:** 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 | 8. Review and properly administer/score selected emergent literacy, reading, and writing tests in order to interpret the information derived from the procedures and determine literacy levels. |
| **IRA:** 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 | 9. Ascertain and describe the literacy, reading, and writing skills that students have and present findings in well-written reports. |
| **IRA:** 3.3 | 10. Utilize data to plan for prescriptive remedial teaching. |
| **IRA:** 3.4 | 11. Communicate assessment results to colleagues, parents and students. |
| **IRA:** 3.1, 6.3 | 12. Identify and use appropriate sources of current information about reading/ writing diagnosis, including ERIC resources and Internet resources. |
| **IRA:** 3.1, 6.3 | 13. Identify ways that technology can be incorporated into the diagnostic process and utilize computer-based assessment procedures when applicable and available. |

|  |
| --- |
| **ASSESSMENT OF LEARNER OUTCOMES** |

1. Outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 will be directly assessed through class discussion, informed participation, and written reflection. Outcomes 1-5 will also be covered in the context of the assessment projects when the issues involved arise.
2. Outcomes 6, 7, and 8 will be assessed through clinical sessions with student and diagnostic projects.
3. Outcomes 9, 10, and 11 will be assessed through diagnostic report, case presentation, parent conference, and feedback questionnaires.
4. Outcomes 12 and 13 will be assessed through class discussion and written reflection.

|  |
| --- |
| **MODES OF INSTRUCTION** |

The class includes:

* reading assignments
* lecture and discussion with a focus on the collaborative sharing of experiences related to reading/writing processes and diagnostic problem-solving
* peer workshop sessions to practice administration and scoring of measures used for evaluating reading and writing skills
* assessment quizzes
* supervised and independent assessments of children: 4-5 sessions, 90 mins.+/- each
* drafting and revising of diagnostic reports
* case presentations

|  |
| --- |
| **CLOCK HOURS** |

Federal regulations require that instructional hours (time spent in class) and minimum hours necessary for outside preparation (readings, assignments, projects) be indicated for each course.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Weekly Hours** | **Total Hours**  **(Semester, 15 week course)** | **Credits Earned** |
| **Lecture** | 2.5 | 37.5 | - |
| **Readings/Study Time** | 2 | 30 | - |
| **Assignments/Projects** | 3 | 45 | - |
| **Total Hours** | 7.5 | 112.5 | 3 |

|  |
| --- |
| **EVALUATION** |

1. **Scored Practice Assessments for Each Norm-Referenced Test: 10%** To gain the *required practice* with the assessments prior to administering them in the clinic, you will be expected to administer/score each test at least two times. According to the schedule on the syllabus, practice assessments will be completed in two ways: 1) as a whole class assignment; and, 2) with your clinic partner or, if necessary, another volunteer. **One scored assessment must be turned in, but you may choose to do more depending upon the complexity of the measure and your familiarity with its forms or subtests.**
2. **Reading/Writing Assessment Portfolio and Report\*: 50%**

Teams consisting of two students in RDG 568 will spend part of several class sessions at SCSU conducting a diagnostic evaluation of one school-age child with learning problems. **Results of the evaluation are provided in a written case study report that is prepared by each team of SCSU students. This report derives a shared grade.**  The draft and final copy are weighted as follows: **20% & 30%.** A template for the assessment report (word processed) for parents will be provided, and sections of the report will be drafted in conjunction with the clinic sessions. Reports in process will be turned in on specific dates noted in the course calendar. Edits and revisions will be completed using the “Track Changes” tool in Microsoft; however, any draft with 10 or more typographical/grammatical/ punctuation/spelling errors will be returned to the team before continuing with the review. Criteria for excellent (“target”) work on this project are noted on page 10 of the syllabus. **\*The final diagnostic report is the *Gate Related Evidence Assignment for this course and must be entered into TK20. Be sure to have an account/password by March 1.***

**4)Case Presentation 10%**

Cases will be presented in class for discussion at the end of the semester. This requirement will enable each team to demonstrate their ability to communicate assessment data and information to colleagues and others. For this assignment, develop a bulleted list of talking points in your report that describe what you have learned about the reading and writing skills of your student (by domain, do not report individual scores for every test administered), his/her strengths and needs, and instructional recommendations. Talking points will be turned in.

1. **Team Collaboration 5%**

Each member of the team will receive a collaboration grade for his/her ability to work productively and professionally with one another during the clinic sessions and report writing. The overall quality of the assessment, report, and parent conference largely depends upon your ability to support one another, carefully observe and discuss reading and writing issues during testing sessions, communicate respectfully, problem-solve, and equally share the work.

**6) Class Attendance & Participation 15%**

Attendance and informed participation in weekly workshops are required for each class session. Also, during the case presentations, you are expected to give feedback to all other diagnostic teams so that they may use this information to strengthen their final drafts of the diagnostic report.

1. **Written Reflection (3-5 pages) 10%**

The reflection has three key elements.

* First, reflect on your experience working with a student in the diagnostic clinic. Focus on the importance of using assessment to inform reading instruction for an individual student (evidence-based needs). Discuss any challenges you may have encountered using a variety of assessments throughout the sessions as well as any issues that may have arisen collaborating with your partner.
* Second, identify insights/new questions you have in relation to evaluating students (including English learners) using multiple assessments, communicating information to teachers and/or parents, selecting classroom materials, and planning instruction. This section of your reflection should specifically reference a research article or text that addresses literacy work with English Learners, e.g. (Abe, 2010); (Feger, 2006); (Gibbons, 2009)
* Identify and briefly describe one additional resource and one additional test (not used in this class) that relate to literacy assessment. Examples of resources include an on-line site, educational agency such as SERC, professional conference, a current research study, or subject-specific library. Examples of tests not used in this class are the *Nelson-Denny Reading Test*, DIBELS, *Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test*, ***Stieglitz Informal Reading Inventory*, etc.**  The resources/tests you choose should facilitate your ongoing professional development (e.g. next steps) as a reading educator.

**Special Notes (Class):**

1. Southern Connecticut State University provides reasonable accommodations in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. If you are a student with a documented disability, the University’s Disability Resource Center (DRC) can work with you to determine appropriate accommodations. Before you receive accommodations in this class, you will need to make an appointment with the Disability Resource Center located at EN C-105A.  To discuss your approved accommodations with me or other concerns, such as medical emergencies or arrangements in case the building must be evacuated, please make an appointment before the third class.
2. The course syllabus is subject to change. Assessments used during diagnostic sessions may vary due to their availability, appropriateness, and/or the readiness of clinicians to use them knowledgeably. When possible, the instructor will make every effort to inform students as to the nature of any changes.
3. **We are unable to “loan” test kits to students since they are used in a variety of classes here at the university.** However, if you make arrangements to come to SCSU during my office hours and set up an appointment with me, I can make the tests available to you. Also, your school may have copies that you can use for practice, and most tests can be borrowed from agencies such as SERC. While practice with the assessments may present certain challenges, the goal is to ensure that you are well-prepared to administer and score these tests correctly once clinic begins. Reasonable accommodations will be made so that everyone has ample practice with the tests, but it is an important professional responsibility that you take the necessary steps to gain familiarity with them.
4. Attendance at each session is required for participation in our workshops and diagnostic sessions. A review of professional literature and/or final exam will be required of any student who misses more than one scheduled class, or anyone whose class participation is below an acceptable standard.

**Special Notes (Reports):**

1. Reports will be developed from a class template.
2. Drafts must be submitted to the instructor via an e-mail attachment. The university expects faculty and students to use their Owls e-mail for school business. Drafts will be submitted twice; the first draft will reflect assessments completed to date; the second draft will reflect *all* assessments administered during the clinic *as well as revisions to work already submitted (first draft)*. All edits and revisions will be completed through “Track Changes” in Microsoft Word and returned using Reply to All. It is the responsibility of team members to communicate with one another.
3. All drafts will be graded beginning from a score of 100.
   1. To ensure professionalism of work developed in this class (especially final drafts of the report), each spelling/typographical error diminishes the grade by 1 point. Each grammatical error will further diminish the grade by 1 point. Other errors will be treated similarly.
   2. Proofreading is an essential skill in the preparation of reports.
4. Complete test names (and acronyms) followed by a concise and accurate summary of its content/purposes will be provided in the assessment report. Do NOT change this information, nor should you change any of the formatting (e.g. tables, etc.).
5. Diagnostics reports and recommendations must be based on evaluation outcomes.
6. Test Scores and all other data must be recorded accurately (check, double-check, and triple-check). Use pencil - NOT PEN – on all test record forms.
7. Avoid first person and passive construction in the diagnostic report (e.g. ‘It was observed…).
8. Refer to yourself as the clinician for the initial demographic information and signature page on the report; refer to the student by his/her first name throughout the report.
9. A copy of the final report and all tests (informal and norm-referenced) administered during the clinic session will be kept in your student’s Reading Department folder.
   1. Two copies of the report will be given to parents on the night of conferences so that, if they choose, a copy of the report can be shared with their child’s school.
   2. Parents may also wish to have their children continue with the reading clinics offered at the SCSU. While we cannot guarantee enrollment, children who attend the assessment clinic have priority for participation in future remediation/intervention clinics. Enrollment for all reading clinics is handled by the department secretary, Rosa Clough. She can be reached at 203-392-6400.
10. Lastly, the final report with identifying information for the student/parents removed – use student’s first name only - must be uploaded to TK 20. Keep a copy of the final report for your records.

**Course Schedule (shaded rows indicate diagnostic session with student)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Topic** |
| 1/13/14  (1) | 1. Course Introduction 2. Knowledge Rating Scale: Assessments 3. Ethical Practice & Responsibilities 4. Purposes of Assessment\* 5. Getting Started with Assessment   Evaluating reading affect  **Workshop**   1. Surveys – Elementary Reading Attitude Survey (ERAS); Motivation to Read 2. Interest Interviews 3. Parent Interview |
| 1/27/14  (2) | Interactive View of Reading & Writing  Diagnostic Report Writing: Discuss & Review of Template   1. Evaluating Developmental Reading 2. Phonological processing: 3. Evaluating Emergent & Basic Skills 4. Early Literacy 5. Letter & Sound Knowledge, Word Patterns   **Workshop**   1. Comprehensive Test of Phon. Processing (CTOPP) 2. QRI (Early Literacy Assessments) |
| 2/3/14  (3) | Evaluating Emergent & Basic Skills  1. Letter & Sound Knowledge, Word Patterns  2. Spelling  **Workshop**  1. CORE Phonics Survey  2. Test of Written Spelling  3. BRI:  a. Word Lists  4.Assessment: Test of Word Reading Efficiency (TOWRE - 2)  5. Woodcock Reading Mastery Test-R (WRMT)   1. Word Identification subtest 2. Word Attack subtest |
| 2/10/14  (4) | Evaluating word reading accuracy, reading rate, fluency (oral, silent), oral/silent reading comprehension, listening comprehension  **Workshop**   1. Gray Oral Reading Test-5 2. Test of Silent Word Reading Fluency 3. Test of Contextual Silent Reading Fluency 4. BRI (oral and/or silent reading passages, listening level as appl.) 5. Woodcock Reading Mastery Test (WRMT) - Comprehension Cluster |
| 2/17/14  (5) | Evaluating vocabulary & writing, and spelling  **Workshop**   1. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - 4 2. Test of Reading Comprehension (relational vocabulary & sentence completion) 3. Test of Written Language -3 (Spontaneous Writing subtests) *or* Test of Early Written Language (selected subtests) |
| 2/24/14  (6) | Review of Assessments to Date |
| 3/3/14  (7) | **Diagnostic Session/Guided Assessment (5:15 – 6:45 PM)**   * Student Questionnaire & Attitude/Motivation Survey * WRMT -R (Basic Skills Cluster) * CORE Phonics Survey * PPVT III * Parent Interview |
| 3/10/14  (8) | **Diagnostic Session/Guided Assessment (5:15 – 6:45 PM)**   * Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing (CTOPP) * Test of Word Reading Efficiency (TOWRE) * Test of Silent Word Reading Fluency * Test of Written Spelling |
| 3/17/14  (9) | **Diagnostic Session/Guided Assessment (5:15 – 6:45 PM)**   * Gray Oral Reading Test (GORT-5) * TORC (vocab subtests only) |
| 3/24/14  (10) | Reviewing and Analyzing Results  Developing a Hypothesis/Interpretation  Generating Recommendations to Date |
| 4/7/14  (11) | **Diagnostic Session/Guided Assessment (5:15 – 6:45 PM)**   * BRI * Test of Written Language (selected subtests) |
| 4/21/14  (12) | **Diagnostic Session/Guided Assessment (5:15 – 6:45 PM)**   * Test of Contextual Silent Reading Fluency * WRMT -R (Comprehension Cluster) * Student Feedback Questionnaire |
| 4/28/14  (13) | Revise/Edit First Draft Reports |
| 5/5/14  (14) | Team Planning for Case Presentation/Parent Conferences  Case Presentations |
| 5/12/14  (15) | Parent Conferences\*  Update Student Folders (Report and Assessments)  ***\*Arrive in class early enough to sign copies of final report.*** |

**IMPORTANT NOTE:**

Your final grade for this course will be calculated once reports are uploaded to TK20. Any student who does not upload the final report to TK 20 by the deadline will receive an incomplete.

**ASSIGNMENT RUBRIC FOR ASSESSMENT #4: DIAGNOSTIC PORTFOLIO**

**Southern Connecticut State University**

**Graduate Reading Program**

**Student: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Program: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Course: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RDG 568**: **Diagnostic Portfolio**  **Assessment of internship, practicum, or other clinical experience** | | | | |
| **Element** | **IRA Standard** | **Unacceptable (1)** | **Acceptable (2)** | **Target (3)** |
| 1. Understand types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations. | 3.1 |  |  |  |
| 2. Select, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes. | 3.2 |  |  |  |
| 3. Use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction. | 3.3 |  |  |  |
| 3A. Use multiple data sources to analyze individual readers’ performance and to plan instruction and intervention. | 3.3 |  |  |  |
| 4. Communicate assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences. | 3.4 |  |  |  |
| 4A. Analyze and report assessment results to a variety of appropriate audiences, including parents, for relevant implications, instructional purposes, and accountability. | 3.4 |  |  |  |
| 4B. Facilitate teachers in using individual assessment data to make instructional decisions for this student. | 3.4 |  |  |  |
| 4C. Provide assistance to the classroom teacher in differentiating instruction and instructional materials including traditional print, digital, and online resources that capitalize on diversity. | 4.2 |  |  |  |
| 5. Describe strategies to support equity in assessment for culturally and linguistically diverse students | 4.3 |  |  |  |
| 6. Writing quality—use of English language conventions including spelling, error free |  |  |  |  |

**Scoring guide:**

1. Score x 3 = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 4. Score x 3 = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 5. Score x 1 = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

2. Score x 3 = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 4A. Score x 1 = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 6. Score x 3 = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3. Score x 2 = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 4B. Score x 1 = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3A. Score x 2 = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 4C. Score x 1 = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **Total score =** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_Target 60-56=A

\_\_\_\_\_Acceptable 55-54=A- 53-51=B+ 50-48=B

\_\_\_\_\_Unacceptable 47-45=B- 45-44=C+ 43-42=C below 42 = F

**Assignment Grade =** \_\_\_\_\_

**EXPLANATION OF ASSIGNMENT RUBRIC FOR DIAGNOSTIC PORTFOLIO**

**RDG 568**: **Diagnostic Portfolio**

**Assessment of internship, practicum, or other clinical experience**

**Assessment #4**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RDG 568**: **Diagnostic Portfolio**  **Assessment of internship, practicum, or other clinical experience** | | | | |
| **Element** | **IRA Standard** | **Unacceptable (1)** | **Acceptable (2)** | **Target (3)** |
| 1. Understand types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations. | 3.1 | Inadequate knowledge of measures to assess different types of reading skills; unable to identify how to use assessments to better understand student’s needs | Developing knowledge of measures to assess different types of reading skills; able to identify how to use a variety of assessments to better understand student’s needs | Well-developed knowledge of multiple measures to assess different types of reading skills; able to identify how to effectively use multiple assessments to better understand student’s needs |
| 2. *S*elect, develop, administer, and interpret assessments, both traditional print and electronic, for specific purposes. | 3.2 | Uses a limited range of assessments or selects inappropriate assessments; makes errors in administration and/or scoring of assessments; interpretation is sometimes superficial or inaccurate; selected assessments do not provide specific information on different components of skilled reading | Uses a variety of appropriate assessments; follows test guidelines to correctly administer and score assessments; interpretation is accurate but sometimes over-generalized; selected assessments provide some specific information on different components of skilled reading | Uses the most relevant assessments; follows test guidelines to correctly administer and score assessments; interpretation is accurate and specific; selected assessments provide essential information on different components of skilled reading |
| 3. Use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction. | 3.3 | Assessment information is incomplete; does not provide clear information for setting reading goals and/or evaluating the effectiveness of instruction/intervention; instructional strategies and materials are not well matched to student’s needs. | Assessment information is complete; provides clear information for setting reading goals and/or evaluating the effectiveness of instruction/intervention; instructional strategies and materials are matched to student’s needs. | Assessment information is complete and detailed; provides clear and comprehensive information for setting reading goals and evaluating the effectiveness of instruction/intervention; instructional strategies and materials are well matched to student’s needs. |
| 3A. Use multiple data sources to analyze individual readers’ performance and to plan instruction and intervention. | 3.3 | Few sources of data; insufficient information to analyze individual reading performance; data does not inform instruction or intervention | Adequate sources of data; information is sufficient to analyze most aspects of individual reading performance; data informs instruction or intervention | Multiple sources of data; breadth of information allows for a fully detailed and nuanced analysis individual reading performance; data clearly informs instruction and/or intervention |
| 4. Candidates communicate assessment results and implications to a variety of audiences. | 3.4 | Presentation lacks clarity and/or professionalism; little awareness of how to differentiate presentation based on audience | Presentation is clear and professional; can differentiate some parts of presentation based on audience. | Presentation is clear, articulate, and very professional; able to differentiate presentation based on audience. |
| 4A. Analyze and report assessment results to a variety of appropriate audiences, including parents, for relevant implications, instructional purposes, and accountability. | 3.4 | Analysis is incomplete or unsupported by assessment data; limited discussion of implications for instruction in report; few suggestions are provided for home follow-up. | Analysis is supported by assessment data; discusses some implications for instruction in report; provides some general suggestions for home follow-up. | Analysis is well-supported by assessment data; discusses implications for instruction across a variety of contexts in report; provides multiple and engaging suggestions for home follow-up. |
| 4B. Facilitate teachers in using individual assessment data to make instructional decisions for this student. | 3.4 | Presentation lacks professionalism; does not support and/or direct classroom teachers in using assessment data to inform instruction for student; does not provide suggestions for additional assessments to monitor student progress. | Presentation is professional; provides some support and/or direction in helping classroom teachers use assessment data to inform instruction for student; provides some suggestions for additional assessments to monitor student progress. | Presentation is professional; provides direct and clear support in how classroom teachers can use assessment data to inform instruction for student; provides suggestions for additional assessments, as well as guidance in their administration, to monitor student progress. |
| 4C. Provide assistance to the classroom teacher in differentiating instruction and instructional materials, including traditional print, digital, and online resources that capitalize on diversity. | 4.2 | Presentation includes no suggestions for instructional practices that meet the needs of diverse learners; does not identify high quality print, digital, and/or on-line materials that reflect diversity and can be used to differentiate instruction. | Presentation includes general suggestions for instructional practices to meet the needs of diverse learners; suggests some high quality print, digital, and/or on-line materials that reflect diversity and can be used to differentiate instruction. | Presentation includes specific suggestions for instructional practices to meet the needs of diverse learners; knowledgeable about high quality print, digital, and/or on-line materials that reflect diversity and how they can be best used to differentiate instruction for different groups. |
| 5. Describe strategies to support equity in assessment for culturally and linguistically diverse students | 4.3 | Reflection does not address issues that impact equity in assessment for diverse learners. | Reflection contains discussion of some issues that impact equity in assessment for diverse learners. | Reflection is characterized by informed and in-depth discussion of a variety of issues that impact equity in assessment. |
| 6. Writing quality—use of English language conventions including spelling, error free |  | Poor control of language necessary to convey meaning; awkward sentence construction and phrasing; use of jargon; frequent grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors; little attention to producing a report of professional quality | Adequate control of language necessary to convey meaning; generally good sentence construction and phrasing; limited use of jargon; few grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors; attention to producing a report of professional quality | Excellent control of language necessary to convey meaning; good sentence construction and phrasing; no jargon; report is free of grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors; attention to producing a report of professional quality |
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